

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS:

Claims 8, 11, 27, 30 and 33-37 are all of the pending claims after entry of the amendment.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on October 15, 2004, between the Applicants' undersigned representative and the Examiner. In order to satisfy 37 C.F.R. §1.133, a summary of the interview follows.

The purpose of the interview was to describe the application of the references against independent claims 8 and 30. The lack of motivation to combine the references to obtain the features of claim 11 was also discussed.

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. §103 - Kudo:

Claims 8, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kudo (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,815).

Claims 8, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudo (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,815).

The rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following remarks.

Claims 8 and 30 provide novel features which are neither taught nor suggested by the applied references. During the above-noted interview, it was submitted that claims 8 and 30 recite a bundle of photosensitive printing plates, "which are not sealed within a light-shielding wrapper." One skilled in the art would not have been motivated to remove the shielding bag 12

of Kudo in light of its required interaction with the other disclosed elements and its relied upon shielding effects.

The Examiner has now appeared to agree that Kudo generally teaches away from providing this feature because Kudo needs to have the light-shielding aspects of the bag 12. Therefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Figure 1 is requested to be withdrawn in view the interview, the present remarks and the previously submitted remarks. However, the Examiner still asserted that Figure 4 of Kudo shows a configuration that does not include the bag 12 around the recording sheets.

Claims 8 and 30 recite an opening/closing lid that is “removably attached.” Figure 4 of Kudo does not teach a lid having this feature, but instead teaches a lid that is attached at a hinge and fixed to the body 13. That is, the applied lid of Kudo 14 is not removable from the body 13, but is instead attached at the hinge portion. Thus, Kudo does not disclose each feature recited in claims 8 and 30.

Moreover, Applicants point out that the claimed combination of features, including the lid, provides benefits over the art. For example, as noted on page 4 of the specification, printing plate packaging boxes of the prior art require the photosensitive printing plates to be packaged in an internal wrapper. Kudo is an example of a device that requires an internal wrapper. Thus, during its use, it is necessary to first open the packaging box, take out the photosensitive printing plates (or sheets as in Kudo) that are contained in the internal wrapper, and then it is further required to open the internal wrapper having light-shielding properties. Also, because the claimed lid is removably attached, the printing plate packaging box provides advantages not found in Kudo.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 30 are not anticipated by Kudo nor obvious in view of Kudo, and request that the rejections thereof under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn. The rejections of dependent claim 27 should also be withdrawn, at least by virtue of claim 27 depending upon claim 8.

Claims 8, 27 and 30

Claims 8, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dirx (U.S. Patent No. 5,893,002). The rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner applies elements from Dirx in a manner similar to that found in the previous Office Action. The Examiner acknowledges that Dirx fails to disclose the features of claims 8 and 30 regarding the photosensitive printing plates which are not sealed with a light-shielding wrapper. Thus, the Examiner cited *In re Karlson* for an allegation that it would have been obvious to not wrap the “light-sensitive sheets” in a light shielding wrap.

Applicants’ previous arguments regarding the application of *In re Karlson* are still pertinent. As expressed during the interview, the Examiner appears to now acknowledge the general teaching away, found in the references, from providing the claimed box that accommodates photosensitive printing plates which are not sealed with a light-shielding wrapper. Although, the Examiner contested the teaching away in Kudo by citing Figure 4¹, Dirx does not provide such a teaching and, thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Dirx should be withdrawn.

¹ As noted above, Applicants still maintain that the application of Figure 4 does not disclose all of the claimed features.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the features of claims 8, 27 and 30 would not have been taught nor suggested based on the teachings of Kudo and Dirx. Furthermore, one would not have been motivated to modify the references to obtain the claimed features.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Kudo or Dirx in view of Lermer (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,944). The rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 8. During the interview, the Examiner appeared to agree that the references lacked the requisite motivation to be modified so as to derive the features of claim 11. Nevertheless, it is again submitted that Lermer fails to disclose the claimed bundle of photosensitive printing plates that are not sealed within a light-shielding wrapper. Instead, Lermer discloses a medicine-type bottle, which the Examiner points out includes a shrink wrap. However, the shrink wrapping of an entire bottle with a thin polymeric film, as is often used on medicine bottles, would not have taught nor suggested the presently claimed features of claim 11, which include a sheet-type material having a smooth and airtight surface that is adhered to an outer surface of an opening and closing lid of a printing plate packaging box. Instead, at best, if one were to apply the teachings of Lermer to that of the primary references, one would have been taught to shrink wrap the entire device of Kudo nor Dirx. However, there is no motivation found in either Kudo, Dirx nor the medicine bottle of Lermer to apply the thin polymeric film of Lermer to any portion of the primary references and, in

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/921,713

ART UNIT 3728
Q65607

particular, the opening and closing lid. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the preceding remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 33-37 are added to obtain more varied protection for the invention and are submitted to be patentable over the applied references by virtue of their novel and unobvious features.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees (except the Issue Fee and/or the Publication Fee) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel V. Williams
Registration No. 45,221

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 15, 2004